

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria Virginia 22313-1450

Alexandria, Virginia 2231 www.uspto.gov	3-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,174	12/15/2003	Abdlmonem H. BeiteImal	200312051-1	2155
22879 75	590 06/30/2006		EXAM	INER
	ACKARD COMPA	DUONG,	DUONG, THO V	
P O BOX 2724	00, 3404 E. HARMON			
INTELLECTU	AL PROPERTY ADM	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
FORT COLLIN	NS, CO 80527-2400	3753		

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		\mathcal{C}					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/734,174	BEITEIMAL ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tho v. Duong	3753					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 L	December 2003.						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) Thi							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal matters, pr	osecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	alastian sandisanaan						
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	•					
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
11) I he oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	e Action of form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) LJ Other:							

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-10 and 32-37, drawn to a cooling system and its corresponding method of cooling, classified in class 165, subclass 185.
- II. Claims 11-31, drawn to an electronic system, classified in class 361, subclass 704.

 The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the electronic system as claimed does not require the cooling system having a plurality of fins to have a relative low height to width aspect ratio in the spacing between the plurality of fins. The subcombination has separate utility such as a cooling system for a laser diode device or a refrigerating system.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37) CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tho v. Duong whose telephone number is 571-272-4793. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (first Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keasel Eric can be reached on 571-272-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tho v Duong

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3753

D

TD

June 24, 2006